

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ORACLE AMERICA, INC.,

No. C 10-03561 WHA

Plaintiff,

v.

GOOGLE INC.,

Defendant.

**ORDER EXTENDING
DEADLINE FOR LG
TO FILE MOTION FOR
PROTECTIVE ORDER**

Fact discovery in this matter closed on December 16. Due to numerous discovery disputes and issues involving third-party notice, defendant Google Inc. could not timely complete its production and has been producing documents that required third-party notice on a rolling basis. Plaintiff Oracle America, Inc., has acquiesced in Google's late production by declining to seek any discovery relief regarding those documents.


Google informed third party LG Electronics, Inc., that it intended to produce certain documents that may have contained confidential information on January 7, 2016. Google provided the specific documents it intended to produce to LG on January 26. Pursuant to the protective order in this action, LG had fourteen days from the date Google identified the specific documents at issue to object to their production, resulting in a deadline of February 9. On February 8, LG moved to extend that deadline by two weeks to February 23, stating that it had not retained outside counsel until February 5 and that its counsel needs extra time to

1 become familiar with this matter. Oracle opposes LG's request for an extension, inasmuch as
2 Oracle believes the documents at issue may be relevant to its rebuttal expert report due on
3 February 22.

4 LG had more than a month to request this extension and to retain outside counsel, but
5 waited until the last minute to do so. Moreover, LG should already have been familiar with this
6 matter inasmuch as it previously approved Google's production of twelve documents in
7 December 2015. Google's delay in identifying the specific documents it intended to produce
8 ultimately gave LG *more* time to retain counsel for this purpose or seek this extension. LG's
9 objections pertain to Google's production of four documents, so the magnitude of its motion
10 does not warrant a two-week extension. Accordingly, LG shall have until **4:00 P.M. ON**
11 **FEBRUARY 12, 2016** to file its motion. LG should comply with Judge Ryu's procedure for
12 discovery disputes, including meeting and conferring with Google and Oracle and presenting its
13 motion in a joint letter with the parties (Dkt. No. 1459).

14
15 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

16
17 Dated: February 10, 2016.



WILLIAM ALSUP
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE